### DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

# Before The FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Weshington, D.G. 20554

Washington, D.C. 20554

| IISSION                   | JAN I 9 2000<br>THE OF THE CONTRACT COMMENTS |
|---------------------------|--|
| CC Docket N<br>FCC 99-204 | o. 96-45                                     |

In the Matter of )
Federal-State Joint Board on )
Universal Service: )
Promoting Deployment and Subscribership )
in Unserved and Underserved Areas, Including )
Tribal and Insular Areas )

#### REPLY COMMENTS OF PROJECT TELEPHONE COMPANY

Project Telephone Company, Inc., Scobey, Montana (Project) files these Reply

Comments in response to Comments filed December 17, 1999 by various parties in this

proceeding.<sup>1</sup> Project is an incumbent Rural Telephone Company in south central Montana with a substantial portion of its service area on the Crow Reservation.<sup>2</sup>

## I THE RECORD DEMONSTRATES THAT NOT ALL RESERVATIONS ARE UNSERVED OR UNDERSERVED

A. Rural telephone companies generally have adequate infrastructure in place.

The FNPRM correctly recognizes that despite the overall high average level of telephone subscribership in the nation, there are some areas of the country, especially those inhabited by

No. of Copies rec'd Of List A B C D E

1

Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service, *Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, FCC 99-204, Sep. 3, 1999 (FNPRM); Public Notice, DA 99-2607, Nov. 22, 1999.

Project, together with Range Telephone Cooperative, Inc., filed extensive Comments and Reply Comments in regard to the application of Western Wireless Corporation for designation as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier, DA 99-1847. Those comments are incorporated by reference herein.

Native Americans where there are severe deficiencies in the availability of, or subscription to, telephone service. <sup>3</sup> Several parties' comments point out, however, that many Rural Telephone Companies have deployed modern telephone facilities throughout the reservations they serve. <sup>4</sup> NTCA presented the results of a survey of its members which supports the conclusion that "small and rural ILECs have overcome many obstacles and built the infrastructure necessary to deliver telecommunications services to the tribal lands that they serve." These observations are consistent with Project's comments in the Western Wireless proceeding in which it pointed out that telephone service is available to virtually all households within Project's portion of the Crow Reservation.

B. Rural telephone companies have made significant efforts to assist tribal communities and encourage subscribership

Despite the availability of telephone service, Rural Telephone Companies, such as Project recognize that subscribership on reservations typically remains well below the national average.<sup>7</sup> Project, like other Rural Telephone Companies has made significant efforts to assist

FNPRM at para. 5.

Montana Public Service Commission at 2, "...any problem on Indian lands...is not caused by an absence of ready, willing, and able providers. The cause is more likely depressed economic conditions," TDS at 4; NRTA and OPASTCO at 4-7...

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> NTCA at 2-5.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Comments of Project Telephone Company, Inc. and Range Telephone Cooperative, Inc. DA 99-1847, Oct. 12, 1999 at 6.

The Attachment to Western Wireless' Comments included a chart purporting to show over 1,100 homes without telephone service on the Crow Reservation out of a total of

tribal communities economically and to increase subscribership.<sup>8</sup> Contrary to the comments of Qualcomm,<sup>9</sup> local service rates of Rural Telephone Companies such as Project are not higher than urban rates. Project's local service rate is \$13.84 per month, with a full \$10.50 reduction available to Lifeline customers.<sup>10</sup> Project also recognizes that an expansion of the local calling area to include the major trading area is much desired by its Crow Reservation subscribers.<sup>11</sup> Project has been working for more than two years to obtain regulatory permission to enlarge the calling area.<sup>12</sup>.

- II THE EXTREMELY ADVERSE ECONOMIC CONDITIONS ON RESERVATIONS REQUIRE THE CONTINUED ADEQUACY OF THE UNIVERSAL SERVICE PROGRAM TO MAINTAIN AFFORDABLE RATES.
  - A. Poverty and unemployment are a major cause of non-subscribership.

Despite the availability of modern service at reasonable rates on reservations served by

<sup>1,700</sup> homes. These numbers are inconsistent with other known data. Project, by itself, currently serves approximately 1,700 access lines on the Reservation, U S West serves approximately 500 and Range Telephone Cooperative serves 38. for a total of 2238. There are relatively few second lines in Project's portion of the Reservation.

<sup>8</sup> Project/Range Comments at 8-10.

<sup>9</sup> Qualcomm at 4.

As Project has explained previously to the Commission, lifeline eligibility remains a problem in Montana due to the interaction of Montana statutes and the Commission's rules. CITE. Project has actively sought to obtain revisions in these rules.

<sup>11</sup> Crow Tribal Council at 2.

Project/Range Comments at 7, Attachment C. Project began the inquiry into EAS long before Western Wireless announced its intention to seek ETC status on the Crow Reservation.

Rural Telephone Companies, the high levels of poverty and unemployment create a barrier to subscribership which is beyond the ability of the carriers to solve.<sup>13</sup> Nevertheless, Rural Telephone Companies, such as Project do provide economic assistance, directly and indirectly to the best of their ability. Project has, for example, sought to maximize the proportion of its staff jobs filled by tribal members, with a preference to those who speak the Crow language, has provided technological training, utilized technology to provide educational opportunities on the Crow Reservation and has appointed a member of the Tribe to its Board of Directors.<sup>14</sup>

B. The Commission must consider whether reservations with low density/high cost and extreme poverty will actually benefit from duplication of service.

It is certainly understandable that the Commission and tribal authorities should seek ways to encourage telecommunications investment by new entities on reservations where the incumbents have failed to deploy adequate facilities. It is an entirely different question, however, when carriers, such as Project, have aggressively invested in modern facilities and demonstrated their intent and ability to evolve those facilities to advanced services capabilities. Several comments point out that in these situations, the low subscribership levels which result from the economic conditions on the reservation mean that the incumbent's operation is at the very margin of financial feasibility.<sup>15</sup> If this low number of subscribers is then divided with

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> See, RUS at 10.

Project/ Range Comments at 7-9.

Gila River Telecommunications, Inc. at 2, South Dakota Independent Telephone Coalition, Inc. at 4 (quoting NTTA comments in the Smith-Bagley application); Montana PSC at 2.

another carrier, there will be a steep decline in revenue, but little decline in costs. The consequences are appropriately described by the Montana PSC as: "a waste of resources to authorize duplicate facilities for providing telecommunications service simply to realize that the duplicate facilities are equally unaffordable to those wishing to subscribe." Whatever the presumptions in other markets, the Commission or a state commission, should, in every case involving reservations, carefully consider the public interest question of whether the area can, in fact, support carriers with duplicate facilities.

The uneconomic duplication issue is particularly acute in respect to grant of ETC status to wireless carriers because the Commission has failed to adopt rules clearly specifying how such carriers are to receive support. For example, the Commission has not yet determined the minimum amount of usage that must be provided with a supported service.<sup>17</sup> United States Cellular Corporation points out that the Commission's orders do not contain "any real discussion, beyond 'competitive neutrality' platitudes, of how wireless carriers' cost structures are to be fitted into the new universal service support structure." <sup>18</sup> Century comments that the current wireline based support model "will provide correct entry and investment signals to a CMRS carrier only by chance." <sup>19</sup> PCIA's recent Petition for Reconsideration describes the gaps

Montana PSC at 2-3.

Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service, *Report and Order*, 12 FCC Rcd 8776, 8813 (1997).

United States Cellular Corporation at 3-7.

CenturyTel, Inc. at 13.

in the rules detail.<sup>20</sup> Until both wireless and wireline carriers can understand how competition between them as ETCs will work, the uncertainties inhibit both from improving service.<sup>21</sup>

C. Continued Universal Service Support on reservations is so important that Commission must get rural rules correct

Despite criticism of the Universal Service Fund in some circles as support for "wealthy farmers," there is no wealth on the reservations. Maintenance of a universal service support program that is sufficient, predictable and specific is absolutely critical for rural telephone companies serving reservations.

The Commission's recently adopted revised universal service support mechanism for non-rural companies will ultimately, if not immediately, eliminate universal service support for most non-rural companies serving on reservations. This result is primarily caused by the decision to provide support only where the state average forward looking cost, as determined by the Commission's model, exceeds 135% of the national average. The proposal in the FNPRM to permit creation of separate study areas on reservations, might help reservation subscribers of some rural carriers as long as they remain under the current rules. Separate study areas will do nothing for subscribers to non-rural carriers in states, such as Montana, where the state average cost as determined by the model is below the benchmark, unless that study area then comes

Petition for Reconsideration and/or Clarification of the Personal Communications Industry Association, CC Docket No. 96-45, January 3, 2000.

Puerto Rico Telephone Company, Inc. correctly notes at p. 12 that the Commission has decided to auction frequencies used for BETRS and shared by paging, this service will have no more utility for the provision of universal service.

under the rural telephone company rules, and the Commission does not apply the state-wide average qualification criteria to rural telephone companies.<sup>22</sup> The cap on the high cost fund would also need to be removed in order to avoid diluting the support for other carriers.<sup>23</sup>

Application of the recently adopted rules for non-rural telephone companies to Rural Telephone Companies would cause significant increases in local service rates which in turn would severely harm the existing penetration levels.<sup>24</sup> The Commission must recognize that a few years of "hold-harmless" will not prevent a tragic result if the local rates must be raised by substantial amounts at the end of the period. In short, any changes to the universal service support must meet the statutory test of being adequate, specific and predictable.

Project agrees that the proposed changes in the lifeline rules should be adopted, to include that necessary to avoid the Montana statutory restriction on eligibility.<sup>25</sup> The Commission should also consider means to support expansion of local calling areas, since major trading areas are often located off of reservations.

FNPRM at para. 64; at the end of the Hold Harmless period, the Commission's new mechanism will provide no universal service support to U S West in Montana. News, FCC Reforms High-Cost Support to Ensure the Preservation and Advancement of Universal Service, Report No. CC 99-49, Oct. 21, 1999.

FNPRM at para. 67.

Preliminary analysis discussed at the Rural Task Force meeting January 13, 2000 indicated substantial reductions in support for Rural Telephone Companies if the non-rural rules and methods are applied to both sets of carriers.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>25</sup> FNPRM at para. 71 and n. 148.

### III THE RECORD CONTAINS INSUFFICIENT ANALYSIS OF THE COMPLEX LEGAL AND FACTUAL ISSUES REGARDING STATE JURISDICTION

A. The complex legal issues regarding jurisdiction have not been adequately explored on the record.

Although the FNPRM discussed at considerable length the questions regarding the jurisdiction of tribal authorities, states and the Commission, few of the comments provide an in depth analysis of these very complex issues.<sup>26</sup> Some parties correctly recognize that the adoption of Section 214(e)(6) neither reduced the jurisdiction of state commissions nor increased the jurisdiction of this Commission, except where there is no state jurisdiction.<sup>27</sup>

The FNPRM suggests that where a tribal authority challenges the state's jurisdiction, that the question be resolved in the course of a Section 214(e)(6) application. While it is correct that "the inquiry is a particularized one," there are also substantial general issues upon which the Commission should reach conclusions as soon as it has an adequate record. The problem with leaving all issues to particular cases is two-fold. First, the broad questions regarding the scope of the authority of the various interests will be litigated among a potentially narrow range of

FNPRM at paras 33-53, 73-82. Only the Montana PSC commented from the perspective of a state commission which regulates non-tribal carriers serving on reservations. But see, Joint Comments of the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community and the National Tribal Telecommunications Alliance at 3-14, 17-18. Project discussed the question of jurisdiction at length in its comments on the Western Wireless Crow Reservation application, and incorporates them by reference here.

Century at 5, In this context, CTIA's comment that Section 214(e)(6) was intended to enable carriers serving on tribal lands to obtain ETC status from the Commission, CTIA at 5, is correct only to the extent that state commissions do not have otherwise have jurisdiction, such as in the case of tribally owned carriers.

parties. Second, without general guidance on these very important issues, carriers will be in the position of devoting substantial resources without adequate knowledge of their regulatory status.

B. A declaration that States have no jurisdiction would create an immediate regulatory vacuum to the potential detriment of reservation inhabitants.

Several parties suggest that the Commission should find that state commissions have no jurisdiction on reservations as a matter of tribal sovereignty, but do not address the practical difficulties which would flow from such a finding.<sup>28</sup> Among the questions not addressed are: would all state rate, service quality and entry regulation and decisions immediately become inoperative? Are tribal authorities on all reservations prepared to assume the state functions? Are existing state ETC designations invalid as to the service areas all or partially within reservations? <sup>29</sup> If state jurisdiction does not extend to reservations, can on-reservation subscribers receive support from state universal service funds? The Commission must address these questions and other ramifications of displacing the status quo in any resolution of the jurisdictional issues.

#### IV **CONCLUSION**

Project Telephone Company, Inc. has shown that the Commission should not presume that all reservations are unserved or underserved. Rather, it should recognize that Rural

Tuscarrora Indian Nation of New York, at 2, suggests a National Indian Policy Statement.

Western Wireless at 5, n.10 suggests that states have jurisdiction over carriers whose service on reservations is "incidental" to a larger service offering, but not to designate ETCs "targeted" to a reservation. No support or logic is provided for this position.

Telephone Companies, such as Project, have made significant and continuing efforts to deploy adequate infrastructure and provide economic assistance on reservations. The low levels of subscribership in such situations are primarily the result of the poverty and unemployment on the reservations. Where subscribership is low, the Commission must consider whether using Universal Service—support to encourage additional service providers may actually harm the public. It is important that the universal service rules to be adopted for rural telephone provide specific, predictable and sufficient support. Finally, the record in this proceeding leaves unanswered many significant questions regarding the jurisdiction of state commissions on reservations, particularly the impacts on reservations which are not prepared to take over the state functions.

Respectfully submitted,

Project Telephone Company, Inc.

By: David Cosson

Its Attorney

Kraskin, Lesse & Cosson, LLP 2120 L St. N.W., Suite 520 Washington, D.C. 20037

202-296-8890

### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Quita Gould, of Kraskin, Lesse & Cosson, LLP, 2120 L Street, NW, Suite 520, Washington, DC 20037, hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing "Reply Comments of Project Telephone Company", was served this 19th day of January, 2000, by first class, U.S. Mail, postage prepaid to the following parties:

Ouita Gould

Hon. William E. Kennard, Chairman \* Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street, SW, Room 8-B201 Washington, DC 20554

Hon. Susan Ness, Commissioner \*
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW, Room 8-B115
Washington, DC 20554

Hon. Harold Furchtgott-Roth \*
Commissioner
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW, Room 8-A302
Washington, DC 20554

Hon. Michael K. Powell, Commissioner \*
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW, Room 8-A204
Washington, DC 20554

Hon. Gloria Tristani, Commissioner \* Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street, SW, Room 8-C302 Washington, DC 20554

Larry Povich\*
Common Carrier Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW, Room 6-A130
Washington, DC 20554

Eric Jensen\*
Office of Communication Business Opportunities
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW, Room 7-C250
Washington, DC 20554

Sheryl Todd (diskette)\*
Accounting Policy Division
Common Carrier Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW, Room 5-A523
Washington, DC 20554

International Transcription Services (diskette)\*
Federal Communications Commission
1231 20th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20554

Robert M. Halperin Crowell & Moring, LLP 1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20004 Attorneys for The State of Alaska

John W. Katz, Esquire
Director, State-Federal Relations
Office of the State of Alaska
Suite 336
444 North Capitol Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001
Suite 300
Special Counsel to the Governor

Pamela J. Riley AirTouch Communications 1818 N Street, NW Suite 800 Washington, DC 20036

G. Nanette Thompson, Chair
Dept of Community and Economic Development
Regulatory Commission of Alaska
1016 West Sixth Avenue
Suite 400
Anchorage, AK 99501-1963

Heather H. Grahame
Dorsey & Whitney, LLP
1031 W. 4th Avenue
Suite 600
Anchorage, AK 99501
Attorneys for the Alaska Rural Coalition

Richard S. Rodin
David L. Sieradzki
Ronnie London
Hogan & Hartson, LLP
Columbia Square
555 13<sup>th</sup> Street, NW
Washington, DC 20004
Attorneys for the American Samoa
Telecommunications Authority

Bruce D. Jacobs
Stephen J. Berman
Colette M. Capretz
Fisher Wayland Cooper Leader & Zaragoza, LLP
2001 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Suite 400
Washington, DC 20006

Lon D. Levin Vice President and Regulatory Counsel AMSC Subsidiary Corporation 10802 Parkridge Boulevard Reston, VA 22091

Ronald S. Weinstein, MD Alison Hughes, MPA Kevin M. McNeill, PhD Arizona Telemedicine Program PO Box 245105 Arizona Health Sciences Center Tucson, AZ 85724-5105

Mark C. Rosenblum
Judy Sello
AT&T Corporation
Room 1135L2
295 North Maple Avenue
Basking Ridge, NJ 07920

Gene C. Schaerr
James P. Young
Sidley & Austin
1722 Eye Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006
Attornevs for AT&T Corp.

John T. Scott, III Crowell & Moring LLP 1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20004 Attorneys for Bell Atlantic Mobile, Inc.

S. Mark Tuller
Vice President, Legal and External
Affairs, Secretary and General Counsel
Bell Atlantic Mobile, Inc.
180 Washington Valley Road
Bedminster, NJ 07921

Robert A. Mazer
Albert Shuldiner
Vinson & Elkins, LLP
1455 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20004-1008
Counsel to Constellation Communications, Inc.

John F. Jones
Director of Government Relations
CenturyTel, Inc.
100 Century Park Drive
Monroe, LA 71203

Karen Brinkman
Richard R. Cameron
William S. Carnell
Latham & Watkins
1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20004
Attorneys for CneturyTel, Inc.

Sam S. Painter General Counsel Crow Tribal Council P.O. Box 159 Crow Agency, MT 59022 Lolita D. Smith
Michael F. Altschul
Randall S. Coleman
Cellular Telecommunications Industry Association
1250 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036

Elizabeth Noel, Esquire
Sandra Mattavous-Frye, Esquire
Barbara Burton, Esquire
Office of the People's Counsel for the District of
Columbia
1133 15<sup>th</sup> Street, NW
Suite 500
Washington, DC 20005-2710

Ronald L. Ripley, Esquire
Vice President & Sr. Corporate Counsel
Dobson Communications Corporation
13439 N. Broadway Extension
Suite 200
Oklahoma City, OK 73114

John R. Washakie
Eastern Shoshone Business Council
P.O. Box 538
Fort Washakie, WY 82514

Arthur Stiffarm
Fort Belknap Community Council
R.R. 1 Box 66
Fort Belknap Agency
Harlem, MT 59526

Jimmy Jackson General Communication, Inc. 2550 Denali Street Suite 1000 Anchorage, AK 99503 <u>Its Attorney</u>

Belinda Nelson Gila River Telecommunications, Inc. 7605 West Allison Road Box 5015 Chandler, AZ 85226 Benjamin H. Dickens, Jr.
Michael B. Adams, Jr.
Blooston, Mordkofsky, Jackson & Dickens
2120 L Street, NW
Washington, DC 20037
Attorneys for Golden West Telecommunications
Cooperative. Inc.. Midstate Telephone Company.
Mount Rushmore Telephone Company. Roberts
County Telephone Cooperative Association. RC
Communications. inc.. Sully Buttes Telephone
Cooperative. Inc.. Interstate Telecom Cooperative
and Vivian Telephone Company

Gail L. Polivy GTE Service Corporation 1850 M Street, NW Suite 1200 Washington, DC 20036

Thomas R. Parker GTE Service Corporation 600 Hidden Ridge, MS HQ-E03J43 P.O. Box 152092 Irving, TX 75015-2092

Jeffrey S. Linder Kenneth J. Krisko Wiley, Rein & Fielding 1776 K Street, NW Washington, DC 20006

Mary Eva Candon Government of Guam Guam Telephone Authority P.O. Box 9008 Tamuning, Guam 96931

Michael D. Wilson
Department of Commerce & Consumer Affairs
Division of Consumer Advocacy
250 S. King Street
8th Floor
Honolulu, HI 96813

Gregory Scott
Minnesota Public Utilities Commission
121 7th Place E.
Suite 350
St Paul, MN 55101-2147

Martin Jacobson
Special Assistant Attorney General
Montana Public Service Commission
1701 Prospect Avenue
P.O. Box 202601
Helena, MT 59620-2601

Michael D. Kennedy Barry Lambergman Leigh M. Chinitz Motorola, Inc. 1350 I Street, NW Washington, DC 20005

Philip L. Malet
James M. Talens
Omer C. Eyal
Steptoe & Johnson, LLP
1330 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036
Counsel for Motorola, Inc.

Laura A. Lo Bianco Senior Attorney Iridum North America 8440 S. River Parkway Tempe, AZ 85284

Thomas K. Crowe
C. Jeffrey Tibbels
Law Offices of Thomas K. Crowe, PC
2300 M Street, NW
Suite 800
Washington, DC 20037
Counsel for the Commonwealth of the Northern
Mariana Islands

Margot Smiley Humphrey
Koteen & Naftalin, LLP
1150 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 1000
Washington, DC 20036-4104
Attorney for the National Rural Telecom Association
and TDS Telecommunications Corporation

Kate Kaercher Staurt Polikoff OPASTCO 21 Dupont Circle, NW Suite 700 Washington, DC 20036 L. Marie Guillory
Daniel Mitchell
National Telephone Cooperative Association
4121 Wilson Boulevard
10<sup>th</sup> Floor
Arlington, VA 22203

Joe D. Edge
Tina M. Pidgeon
Courtney R. Eden
Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP
1500 K Street, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Attorneys for Puerto Rico Telephone Company, Inc.

Kelly Cameron
Robert L. Galbreath
Powell Goldstein Frazer & Murphy LLP
1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Sixth Floor
Washington, DC 20004

Tony Rogers
Rosebud Sioux Tribe Utility Commission
P.O. Box 430
Rosebud, SD 57570

Roberta Purcell
Department of Agriculture
Rural Utilities Service
Rm 4046, South Building
Stop 1590
Washington, DC 20250

Charles H. Kennedy
James A. Casey
Morrison & Foerster LLP
2000 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Suite 5500
Washington, DC 20006
Counsel for Salt River Pima

Counsel for Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community and National Tribal Telecommunications Alliance

William W. Quinn
Snell & Wilmer
One Arizona Center
Phoenix, AZ 85004
Counsel for Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian
Community

David A. LaFuria
B. Lynn F. Ratnavale
Lukas, Nace, Gutierrez & Sachs Chartered
1111 19th Street, NW
Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20036
Attorneys for Smith Bagley. Inc.

Richard D. Coit
South Dakota Independent Telephone Coalition
P.O. Box 27
320 East Capitol Avenue
Pierre, SD 57501-0057

Kenneth E. Trout
Summit Telephone Company
2014 Eagan
Fairbanks, AK 99701
Consultant for Summit Telephone and Telegraph
Company of Alaska

Paulette C. Hansen
Tribal Nations Link-up, Inc.
7010 Phoenix Avenue NE #215
Albuquerque, NM 87110

Christopher A. Karns
Dorsey & Whitney LLP
1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Suite 300 South
Washington, DC 20004
Counsel for the Tuscarora Indian Nation

Peter M. Connolly
Koteen & Naftalin LLP
1150 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036
Attorneys for United States Cellular Corporation

Steven R. Beck
US West Communications, Inc.
1020 19<sup>th</sup> Street, NW
Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
Its Attorneys

Walter L. Challenger
Public Service Commission of the Unites States
Virgin Islands
P.O. Box 40
Charlotte Amalie, USVI 00804

Gerard J. Duffy
Blooston, Mordkofsky, Jackson & Dickens
2120 L Street, NW
Suite 300
Washington, DC 20037
Attorneys for The Western Alliance

Gene DeJordy
Vice President of Regulatory Affairs
Western Wireless Corporation
3650 131<sup>st</sup> Avenue, SE
Suite 400
Bellevue, WA 98006

Michele C. Farquhar
David L. Sieradzki
Ronnie London
Hogan & Hartson, LLP
555 13th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20004-1109
Counsel for Western Wireless Corporation

\* Via Hand Delivery